## REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9 and 16-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-7 and 9 are amended; claims 2 and 10-15 are canceled; and claims 16-20 are added. No new matter is added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Salad in the May 20 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

### I. Information Disclosure Statement

An Information Disclosure Statement with Form PTO-1449 was filed in the above-captioned patent application on November 24, 2000. Applicants have not yet received from the Examiner a copy of the Form PTO-1449 initialed to acknowledge the fact that the Examiner has considered the disclosed information. The Examiner is requested to initial and return to the undersigned a copy of the Form PTO-1449. For the convenience of the Examiner, a copy of that form is attached.

### II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action requires renumbering of claims in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.126. Applicants have canceled claims 10-15 and renumbered the claims as new claims 16-20 to obviate this rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### III. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4 and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,664,978 to Kekic et al. ("Kekic"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed during the interview, Kekic does not disclose "providing a runtime that establishes atomicity for the at least one Web object with respect to at least one of events, actions and data that occur in a state of another Web object state machine, wherein Web objects are template-driven mechanisms that compose Web pages," as recited in claim 1. Kekic does not teach such a Web object.

The Office Action asserts that Kekic discloses at least one Web object over a distributed network. Notwithstanding this assertion, it would be impossible for Kekic's managed element object 416 to include a template-driven mechanism that composes a Web page as set forth in claim 1.

Kekic discloses that "each management-enabled computer network element either has a managed element object and an associated poll server and an event engine, or is assigned the predefined element manager name" (col. 17, lines 28-34). However, this is different from the claimed Web objects that are template-driven mechanisms that compose Web pages. Kekic does not disclose Web objects that compose Web pages.

Claim 1 is not anticipated by Kekic. Claims 3-9 and 16-20 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

## IV. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 6 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kekic in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,529,932 to Dadiomov et al. ("Dadiomov"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The subject matter of claim 15 is incorporated into claim 1, claim 15 now being canceled. Thus, the rejection of claim 15 is moot.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, as previously discussed, Kekic does not disclose or suggest "Web objects are template-driven mechanisms that compose Web pages," as recited in claim 1. Dodiomov does not cure the deficiencies of Kekic.

Instead, as discussed during the interview, Kekic discloses "the manager portion of managed element server is independent of any graphic user interface. The logic and structure of the manager of managed element server is cleanly separated from the graphic user interfaces" (Abstract). Dodiomov discloses a method and system for coordinating distributed transactions by atomic processing of distributed transactions on computers in a network with asynchronous message delivery (Abstract), but does not relate to the claimed subject matter of a plurality of networked devices in a Web-based management system, wherein Web objects are template-driven mechanisms that compose Web pages, as argued above. Even if combined, Kekic and Dodiomov do not result in

> ... providing a runtime that establishes atomicity for the at least one Web object with respect to at least one of events, actions and data that occur in a state of another Web object state machine, wherein Web objects are template-driven mechanisms that compose Web pages,

as recited in claim 1. Kekic and Dodiomov do not relate to the claimed features of Web objects that compose Web pages. For the foregoing reasons, Kekic and Dodiomov do not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Claim 1 would not have been rendered obvious by Kekic in view of Dodiomov. Thus, claims 5 and 6 would not have been rendered obvious by Kekic in view of Dodiomov. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

## V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-9 and 6-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Richard J. Kim
Registration No. 48,360

JAO:RJK/mdw

Attachment:
Form PTO-1449 (11/24/00)

Date: May 25, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**
**P.O. Box 19928**
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037